

# CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: Land Breaking of tame grass, formerly conservation reserve program acreage, for conversion to dryland agriculture. Lease No.5767

Proposed Implementation Date: Late Summer-Fall, 2011

Proponent: Deborah M. Callahan, 110 14<sup>th</sup> Street West, Havre, Montana 59501

Type and Purpose of Action: Surface lessee, Deborah M. Callahan has made a land breaking request to the Glasgow Unit Office of the Department of Natural Resources & Conservation. The surface lessee has requested permission to break 191.2 acres of tame/native grass currently listed as conservation reserve program acreage. The land breaking would be a conversion from present use of conservation program acreage that will have an expiring contract date of 9/30/2010, for the purpose of growing small grain crops. The acreage would be reclassified from conservation reserve program acreage to dryland agriculture upon Departmental review and documentation of proposed land breaking project.

Location: W2NE4, SE4NW4, NE4SW4, NW4SE4, Section 23 Township 30 North Range 30 East

County: Phillips

## I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

Deborah M. Callahan the surface lessees has made a request to break 191.2 acres (more or less) of tame grass conservation reserve program acreage on State land Lease No.5767. The request was sent to the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, Glasgow Unit Office for review and evaluation. The request will be reviewed per Department of Natural Resources and Conservation land breaking criteria for all lands other than native sod. The Glasgow Unit Office contacted the following government agency for comments: Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks.

2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

The other government agencies that may have jurisdiction for this project are the United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency and United States Department of Agriculture, Department of Natural Resources and Conservation Service.

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

No Action Alternative: Deny permission to the surface lessees to break 191.2 acres of former conservation reserve program acreage for dryland agriculture to produce small grain crops.

Action Alternative: Grant permission to the surface lessees to break 191.2 acres of former conservation reserve program acreage for dryland agriculture to produce small grain crops.

## II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

RESOURCE

POTENTIAL IMPACTS

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

<p>4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compactible or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?</p>	<p>No Action Alternative: The soils on the State land will remain the same and continue to produce tame/native grass vegetation. The area will continue to produce vegetation for possible livestock grazing/hay production after conservation reserve program ends.</p> <p>Action Alternative: This type of project will impact the soils that are currently producing tame/native grass vegetation. The soils will be broken up for the purpose of producing dryland small grain crops. The soil type that will be broken for dryland agriculture is: Evanston loam, 0 to 4% slopes. The Evanston loam is suitable for dryland agriculture. This soil type has minimal hazard of soil blowing. Telstad-Joplin 2 to 8% slopes. The Telstad-Joplin is suitable for dryland agriculture. This soil type has minimal hazard of soil blowing. The onsite inspection of this tract showed no salinity present in the topsoil profile. The 191.2 acres requested for breaking will maintain current soil qualities and soil stability under dryland agriculture management.</p> <p>Mitigation: There will be no need for a supplemental lease agreement with the lessee to mitigate soil impacts. The soil types on the State land are not unstable and are highly suitable for the growing of small grain crops.</p>
<p>5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality?</p>	<p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative annual precipitation will be utilized by the tame/native grass plant community. There will be no impacts to water quality, quantity and distribution.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project will allow the surface lessee to expand his dryland agriculture small grain production. The land breaking for small grain crops will not use water resources, other than the water associated with the topsoil from annual precipitation.</p>
<p>6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?</p>	<p>No Action Alternative: No impacts will occur to air quality under this alternative.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The breaking of the tame/native grass land acreage for dryland agriculture purposes will have no impacts to the air quality of the State land.</p>
<p>7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?</p>	<p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative the current tame grass plant community will remain intact.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The breaking of the tame/native grass plant community will permanently destroy the current plant community on the project area. The tame/native grass community consisting of conservation reserve program acreage contains no known rare plant species. This plant community is currently crested wheatgrass, alfalfa, needle and thread grass, green needle grass, yellow sweet clover.</p>

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
	The project area will produce small grain crop vegetative type communities after land breaking.
8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	<p>No Action Alternative: The habitat types associated with a tame/native grass plant community will remain intact.</p> <p>Action Alternative: This type of activity will disturb the habitat types on the State land. The area of impact is a tame/native grass plant community. This type of tame/native grass plant community has limited habitat resources. There will be minimal impacts to the wildlife and upland bird resources associated with the State land. There will be some areas of tract that will continue to produce a native rangeland plant community. The remaining native plant community will provide some habitat resources for song birds, upland game birds, waterfowl, and whitetail deer. Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks were asked for their comments concerning this proposal. Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks e-mail states "Scott Thompson has reviewed this parcel and determined that there is no public access to it, other than crossing at least 2 other landowners. We are assuming the FSA doesn't want to re-enroll due to a low EBI score, which often means an undesirable stand (Crested). That it would be marginal nesting cover. So, due to a likely poor quality stand and lack of public access. FWP has no objections to this rather unique break request". Comments were from Mark Sullivan R6 Wildlife Manager, MFWP.</p>
9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Sensitive Species or Species of special concern?	<p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no change to the current environmental resources.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project area contains no known unique, endangered, fragile or limited environmental resources. The project area consists of areas, with tame/native grass vegetation. There are small areas of native rangeland located on other areas of tract. These areas are not part of the project site and will not be impacted by the land breaking process.</p>
10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	<p>No Action Alternative: The project area has no known historical or archaeological sites and existing status would remain.</p> <p>Action Alternative: There are no known historical or archaeological sites on the project area that will be impacted. The project area was inspected by Glasgow Unit Office personnel for archaeological, historical and paleontological resources. There were no historical or archaeological sites identified during the on-site inspection.</p>
11. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light?	<p>No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts that would occur to the aesthetic values associated with the State land under this alternative.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project site is located in a rural area and is not visible to the general public. The project will have no</p>

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
	impacts to the aesthetic values associated with the State land involved with this project or other surrounding lands.
12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?	<p>No Action Alternative: There will be no demands on environmental resources of land, water, air or energy occurring under this alternative.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project will place no demands on environmental resources of land, water, air or energy. Other activities on deeded land located to the east, former conservation reserve program acreage being broken for small grain production.</p>
13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?	<p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there would be no changes to existing plans, studies or projects that the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation may have occurring on the State land.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The breaking of the tame/native grass vegetation will not impact other projects or plans that the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation may have occurring on this tract of State land.</p>

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
RESOURCE	POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	<p>No Action Alternative: No human health or safety risks would occur under this alternative.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The breaking of tame/native grass vegetation for small grain production has minimal human health or safety risks.</p>
15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	<p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no changes to current agriculture activities.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project will enhance the surface lessee's ability to produce small grain or pulse crops on his State land lease. The production of small grain or pulse crops will also enhance the revenue generated for the School Trust.</p>
16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	<p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to quantity and distribution of employment.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project will not impact the quantity and distribution of employment.</p>
17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	<p>No Action Alternative: No local and state tax base and tax revenues would be impacted under this alternative.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project will have no impacts on the local or state tax base.</p>
18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be	<p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no demands for government services.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project will place no demands for government services.</p>



IV. FINDING	
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	<p>No Action Alternative: The no action alternative; was not selected by the Glasgow Unit Office, Unit Manager.</p> <p>Action Alternative: Grant written permission to surface lessee Deborah Callahan to break 191.2 acres of tame/native grass vegetation located on this tract of State land. The 191.2 acres will then be converted to dryland agriculture for small grain production.</p>
26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:	Action Alternative: The project will enhance the natural resources capabilities to produce dryland small grain crops on the State land. The land breaking project will increase revenue for the surface lessees and the School Trust.
27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis: <input type="checkbox"/> EIS <input type="checkbox"/> More Detailed EA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Further Analysis	

EA Checklist Approved By: Hoyt Richards GUO Manager  
Name Title

/s/

4/21/11

Date:

Signature